DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 106 034 32 RC 008 503

TITLE Summary of the Report of Final Evaluation, ESEA Title I Projects, Fiscal Year 1974. Phoenix Area, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of Interior. Final Report.

INSTITUTION Bureau of Indian Affairs (Dept. of Interior), Phoenix, Ariz.

SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Compensatory Education.

PUB DATE Nov 74

NOTE 25p.; For related document, see ED 085 131

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE

DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *American Indians; *Annual Reports; Expenditures; Language Development; Mathematics; Paraprofessional School Personnel; Professional Personnel; Reading; Special Education; Student Enrollment; *Summative Evaluation; *Tables (Data)

IDENTIFIERS Arizona; BIA; *Bureau of Indian Affairs; Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; Phoenix

ABSTRACT

A composite summary of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I projects operated in the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), Phoenix Area, during fiscal year 1974 is given on an area-wide basis. Data, presented by charts and graphs, cover: the BIA's organization; enrollment in the Phoenix Area schools by agency and school; expenditures; student participation; professional and paraprofessional staff by component; and student achievement in reading, language, mathematics, science, and special education. The data show that: (1) most of the Title I projects were highly successful in fiscal year 1974; (2) in language, students gained at a higher rate than the national average in every grade but one; (3) in science, students in grade 7 gained higher than the national average, while students in grades 8 and 9 progressed to a higher level than expected based on prior performance; and (4) in special education, students in grades 3 and 4 gained in overall academic performance at higher than the national average. (NQ)

ED106034

Summary of the

REPORT OF FINAL EVALUATION
ESEA TITLE I PROJECTS
FISCAL YEAR 1974

FINAL REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, EDUCATION

John Artichoker, Jr.
Area Director

Ray Sorensen
Assistant Area Director (Education)

David N. Burch
Deputy Assistant Area Director
(Education)

Harriet B. Hilburn
Federal Programs Administrator

David R. Moers
Title I Specialist

Steven J. Anderson
Title I Specialist

Richard L. Schwartz
Title I Specialist

NOVEMBER 1974

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RC 008 503

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Although the success of Title I programs in the Phoenix Area has involved the efforts of many people, my thanks must first go to the teachers and their aides who have given the most—their talents, hard work, and skills in providing the highest *quality* of education to Indian students. To each teacher and aide the credit must be given to you for the gains made by each student.

To the people in the support branches of Personnel, Property and Supply, Budget, and Plant Management, I wish to extend my sincere appreciation for your assistance.

Our gratitude is also extended to the school and agency administrators, Parent Advisory Councils, Title I Coordinators, administrative and clerical staff who have worked in the planning, writing and typing of proposals, and in keeping the projects operational.

The entire staff at Salt River Day School are to be commended for their successful total school curriculum modification. The success of this modification has provided the impetus for major curriculum change in many of the other Phoenix Area schools.

Harriet B. Hilburn
Federal Programs Administrator
Phoenix Area Office

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	iv
Overview and organization of the Bureau of Indian Affairs	1
Enrollment in the Phoenix Area Schools by Agency and School	4
Expenditures	5
Student Participation	6
Professional and Paraprofessional Staff by Component	7
Student Achievement:	
Reading	8
Language	10
Mathematics	12
Science	14
Special Education	16
Conclusions and recommendations	18
Definition of terms	19

0005

INTRODUCTION

This evaluation report addresses itself to a summary of projects operated in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Phoenix Area, during fiscal 1974. As with last year's report, this one is presented in chart and graph form rather than in narrative form.

Again the Phoenix Area is publishing two evaluation reports. One for general distribution is a composite summary of the data into an area-wide report. The second is an individual school report that presents the data on a grade by grade-school by school basis. The school report is primarily meant for distribution to the Phoenix Area schools; however, copies are available for dissemination.

For further information relative to evaluation of the Title I programs, please contact:

Phoenix Area Office
Division of Education
Attention: David Moers
P.O. Box 7007
Phoenix, Arizona 85011
(602) 261-4161

In each of the 23 schools of the Phoenix Area, there are a variety of programs used for any given area of instruction. Each teacher uses the programs she feels will work best for the students she has in any given class. Thus, to attempt to describe anything other than the process used would be an impossible and meaningless task.

This process remains fairly constant across grades, schools, and subject matter. However, some teachers use it to a more exacting degree than others. The process is one of diagnosis of specific skill deficiencies, use of whatever *appropriate* materials are available for remediation of skill deficiencies, and a retest for mastery of the skill.

A number of the schools have now begun the sophisticated process of identifying skills that must be mastered at each grade from K-12. They are using this hierarchy as a basis for developing instructional materials and mastery tests that can be used in the instructional process to better meet the needs of the students. Once this has been accomplished, there will be an orderly sequential set of materials that can be used from K-12.

The results of using the diagnostic-prescriptive approach in the Phoenix Area Title I projects have demonstrated such a high degree of success that now several schools are beginning to use this process for all students.

0006

OVERVIEW AND ORGANIZATION OF THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Bureau of Indian Affairs was recently reorganized (See Figure 1).

The Phoenix Area Office exercises jurisdiction over Bureau of Indian Affairs schools in a three state region. Figure 2 shows the geographical location of schools in the Phoenix Area. The twenty-one Bureau schools are situated in a three-state region comprised of Arizona, California and Nevada. With the exception of two off-reservation high schools, all are located in Arizona. The two exceptions are Sherman Indian High School in Riverside, California and Stewart Indian High School in Stewart, Nevada. Phoenix Indian High School, the Area's third boarding high school, is located in the heart of Phoenix, Arizona. Additionally, Duckwater Shoshone Elementary School in Nevada is served by Title I but it is not under regular programs jurisdiction.

Located in the White Mountains of eastern Arizona are the John F. Kennedy Day School, Cibecue Day School, and Theodore Roosevelt Boarding School. To the north, approximately 180 miles are the Hopi mesas and the six schools which serve the Hopi children. A mule trip is necessary to reach the Havasupai village, where the Supai Day School is located near the Grand Canyon. Farther south near the Mexico-Arizona border in the Sonoran Desert, is the Santa Rosa Boarding School and three small day schools on the Papago Reservation. Approximately 30 miles south of Phoenix on the Gila River Reservation are the two Pima Bureau day schools, one small tribal operated school and one mission school. Also, located near metropolitan Phoenix is the Salt River Reservation which contains one day school.

Figure 1
Organization—Bureau of Indian Affairs



8000

Figure 2
Phoenix Area Schools



1. Phoenix Indian High School
2. Sherman Indian High School
3. Stewart Indian High School
4. Cibecue Day School
5. John F. Kennedy Day School
6. Theodore Roosevelt Boarding School
7. Hopi Day School
8. Hotevilla Day School
9. Keams Canyon Boarding School
10. Moencopi Day School
11. Polacca Day School
12. Second Mesa Day School
13. Kerwo Day School
14. Santa Rosa Boarding School
15. Santa Rosa Ranch Day School
16. Vaya Chin Day School
17. Blackwater Demonstration School
18. Casa Blanca Day School
19. Gila Crossing Day School
20. St. John's Mission School
21. Salt River Day School
22. Supai Day School
23. Duckwater

Table 1
Enrollment in the Phoenix Area Schools by Agency and School for School Year 1973—74

Agency & School	Grades Served	Number of Students
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS		
Duckwater	1-8	22
Fort Apache Agency		
Cibecue Day School	K-8	292
Theodore Roosevelt Brdg.	5-8	218
John F. Kennedy Day	1-6	112
Hopi Agency		
Hopi Day School	1-8	146
Hotevilla Day School	1-6	87
Keams Canyon Brdg/Day	B-8	402
Moencopi Day School	1-4	64
Polacca Day School	K-6	160
Second Mesa Day School	K-6	257
Papago Agency		
Kerwo Day School	B-4	46
Santa Rosa Boarding/Day	B-8	424
Santa Rosa Ranch Day	B-5	21
Vaya Chin Day School	B-4	71
Pima Agency		
Blackwater Demonstration*	K-1	39
Casa Blanca Day School	K-4	149
Gila Crossing Day School	K-5	171
St. John's Indian School**	1-12	210
Salt River Agency		
Salt River Day School	K-6	213
Truxton Canon Agency		
Supai Day School	B-4	42
HIGH SCHOOLS*		
Phoenix Indian High School	7-12	766
Sherman Indian High School	9-12	726
Stewart Indian High School	8-12	499

* = *Contracted to Community*
** = *Catholic Mission School*
*** = *Off-Reservation Schools*

0010

EXPENDITURES



Total Expenditures: $1,993,912

Expenditures by Instructional Components:

INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT	EXPENDITURE
Reading and Language	$1,014,097
Mathematics	267,316
Special Education	221,308
Science	37,864
Total Academic Achievement	169,738
TOTAL	**$1,710,323**

0011

STUDENT PARTICIPATION

BY COMPONENT



BY GRADES



0012

Table 2
Professional and Paraprofessional Staff by Component

School	Professional		Para-Professional	
	Regular Program	Title 1	Regular Program	Title 1
Reading	79	34	6	74
Language	12	4	1	8
Math	22	14	2	20
Science	3	5	1	6
Special Education	2	10	0	10

Figure 3
Pre-Post California Achievement Test Total Reading Grade Equivalent Score by Grade

0014

Table 3
Actual versus Expected Gains in reading

Grade	Actual Gain Score	Expected Gain Score	Difference
2	.8	.5	+ .3
3	.8	.4	+ .4
4	.8	.5	+ .3
5	.6	.4	+ .2
6	.8	.5	+ .3
7	1.1	.4	+ .7
8	1.5	.4	+1.1
9	.6	.5	+ .1
10	.6	.5	+ .1
11	1.0	.5	+ .5
12	.9	.4	+ .5

Figure 4
Pre-Post California Achievement Test Total Language
Grade Equivalent Scores by Grade
GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES
4.8
4.6
4.4
4.2
4.0
3.8
3.6
3.4
3.2
3.0
2.8
2.6
2.4
2.2
2.0
1.8
1.6
1.4
1.2
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
PRE-TEST
POST-TEST
1st Grade (N = 44)
2nd Grade (N = 72)
3rd Grade (N = 49)
4th Grade (N = 42)
5th Grade (N = 34)
6th Grade (N = 17)

0016

Table 4
Actual versus Expected Gains in language

Grade	Actual Gain Score	Expected Gain Score	Difference
2	.7	.4	+ .3
3	1.1	.4	+ .7
4	1.0	.4	+ .6
5	1.4	.4	+1.0
6	1.5	.5	+1.0

Figure 5
Pre-Post California Achievement Test
Total Math Grade Equivalent Scores by Grade

0018

Table 5
Actual versus Expected Gains in mathematics

Grade	Actual Gain Score	Expected Gain Score	Difference
2	.7	.5	+ .2
3	1.2	.4	+ .8
4	1.0	.5	+ .5
5	.9	.5	+ .4
6	.9	.5	+ .4
7	1.6	.4	+1.2
8	1.4	.5	+ .9
9	1.3	.5	+ .8
10	.7	.5	+ .2
11	1.0	.4	+ .6
12	.4	.4	0

0019

Figure 7

Pre-Post Metropolitan Achievement Test Total Science Grade Equivalent Scores by Grade



0200

Table 6
7th, 8th and 9th Grades
Science Component

Grade	Actual Gain Scores	Expected Gain Scores	Difference
7	+1.1	.6	+.5
8	+ .7	.6	+.1
9	+ .7	.5	+.2

0021

Figure 6
Pre-Post California Achievement Test Total Special Education Grade Equivalent Scores by Grade



2300
0082

Table 7
California Achievement Test Total Battery Grade Equivalent scores for the Special Education Components

Grade	Actual Gain	Expected Gain	Actual-Expected Difference
2	.4	.2	+.2
3	1.1	.3	+.8
4	.9	.5	+.4
5	.5	.3	+.2
6	.2	.4	−.2
7	.7	.3	+.4
8	.7	.4	+.3
9	.7	.3	+.4
10	.5	.4	+.1
11	.6	.3	+.3
12	.5	.4	+.1

CONCLUSIONS

The data presented in this report clearly show that most of the Title I projects were highly successful in FY '74. Students in eight of the 11 grades gained at or above the national average in reading and mathematics. Students in every grade showed higher gains in reading and math than their expected performance based on prior years growth.

In language, students gained at a higher rate than the national average in every grade but one. In every grade the students' progress was higher than their expected gain score.

The science results show that students in grade 7 gained higher than the national average. Students in grades 8 and 9 progressed to a higher level than expected based upon prior performance.

In Special Education, students in two grades (3 and 4) gained in overall academic performance at higher than the national average. Students in ten of the 11 grades progressed to a higher level than expected based upon their past achievement. Only in one grade, grade 6, did students not gain above the rate of their prior performance.

0024

DEFINITION OF TERMS

There are several terms used in the manuscript that might not immediately be clear without some clarification.

N = the number of students who took both the pre and post-test and thus comprise the total number of students included in the test results.

Expected Gain: For purposes of this report, expected gain refers to the gain in grade equivalent score that would be expected if the students did not receive Title I services. The value was computed by dividing the students pre-test score by the number of years in school +1. This yearly expected gain was then adjusted to an 8 month school year by multiplying the expected gain by 4/5. Thus a student beginning the second grade with a pre-test score of 1.6 would have an expected growth of .6 in grade equivalents. While it is recognized that this does not take into account the true gain/loss factor over the summer it was the most accurate figure that could be derived given the limitations of the data.

Test Dates: Dates of administration of the pre-tests were the last 2 weeks in September and of the post-test were the first 2 weeks in May. Thus the school year approximates 8 months rather than 9 months for purposes of this report.

3025

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1974 - 678-873